

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of the present application and request reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention and to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claim 2 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. New Claims 13-19 are added herewith as dependent from Claim 12. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 through 19 are pending in the present application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 – 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1 – 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 has been amended herein to overcome the rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention by removing the terms “may be” and “a reference to.” Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by the present amendment and that the claims, as currently amended, overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected claim 1 with the assertion that the claim is inoperative because it “lacks any input method and processing method for providing the outcome and therefore lacks

utility.” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 has been amended herein to overcome the rejection.

Amended Claim 1 recites “inputting data...” and “processing at least some of said data...” Claim 1 more clearly provides for an input and processing method for providing the outcome and clearly has utility. Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 1 is overcome.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 – 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 – 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,448,739 to Jacobson (hereinafter referred to as “Jacobson”). These rejections are herein traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for exporting data from a database in a format acceptable by another application. This method recites inputting data into a data base including a plurality of line types wherein the types are included in an export format. An export operation from the database is performed using the export format to define a format for data exported from the database. The method includes processing at least some of said data to create an export format selectively including at least one of said plurality of line types. For each line type, the export format includes field length and position for each included export field.

Independent claim 12 recites a system for processing data into a format acceptable by another application. This system requires an export format. The export format defines a format for exporting data from a database and includes at least one line type.

The Examiner asserted that Jacobson discloses a method of recording, playback, and re-execution of application program call sequences and import and export of data in a digital computer system. (Office Action, page 3, first paragraph). The Examiner characterizes Jacobson as comprising the steps of executing programs which “involves import and export of data among the application programs..., providing an application entry containing a command

type filed (sic)..., providing a user interface for exporting data...” (Office Action, page 3, first paragraph).

Contrary to the Examiner’s assertions, Jacobson fails to disclose or suggest all of the features, of applicants’ invention as recited in claim 1 and claim 12.

Jacobson discloses a “system for use in connection with a digital data processing system for facilitating the integration of a plurality of diverse applications into an integrated application.” The Jacobson system does not address exporting data from a database in an export format as a function of line types. Jacobson describes:

an application integration system for use in a digital computer system. The application integration system comprises a command store and an executive, which includes a command recording portion and a command playback portion. The command recording portion is responsive, during a recording phase, to entry of application call commands from an operator each enabling the digital computer system to process an application, and, while each application is being processed, to receive from the application operational commands, for storing the commands in the command store. The command playback portion enables the digital computer system to process the applications identified in the application call commands stored in the command store during a playback phase, and transmits, while each application is being processed, the operational commands therefor to the application for processing.

Jacobson discloses application program integration via processing of call commands received, stored and processed out of a command store. At the portion of the Jacobson description where the Examiner asserts Jacobson discloses “providing a user interface (11) for exporting data (See Figure 2B and Col. 7, lines 35-51),” Jacobson merely discloses and describes an application descriptor table 30.

The application descriptor table 30 includes information as to the various applications 12 which the operator enabled to be invoked by the core executive 10 through the core user interface 11. The major events table 50 identifies selected commands in the command tables, most notably those relating to export and import of data from objects. In addition, the major events table 50 identifies invocation and termination of applications 12 where the order of invocation and termination is determined important. Finally, the events relation table 60 effectively couples events as recorded in the major events table 50 so to relate, for example, export of data to-an object by one application 12(i) with import of data

from the object by another application 12(j), which may be used, for example, in establishing the arrows 17 on the core display window 15.

With reference to FIG. 2A, the application descriptor table 30 includes a plurality of application entries 31, each containing information for a particular application 12 invoked during a recording session.

Jacobson does not disclose or suggest a method for exporting data in a database, such as applicants particularly disclose and claim.

In the office action, the Examiner asserted that the Abstract of Jacobson teaches “the steps of executing programs which involves import and export of data among the application programs.” This may be true but this is not an element of Applicants’ claimed invention. The Examiner also asserted that the Jacobson method includes “providing an application entry containing a command type filed (sic)” as shown in Col 8, lines 24 – 64. This may also be true but this is not an element of Applicants’ claimed invention. While Jacobson discusses import and export of data, it does not disclose or suggest an export operation from a database, using an export format to define a format for data exported from the database wherein the export format includes line types. Jacobson does not teach or suggest including at least one of the associated export fields into an export format including providing field length and position for each included export field.

Likewise, Jacobson does not disclose an export format defining a format for exporting data from a database, the export format including at least one line type, wherein the line type is associated with a plurality of export fields that represent a data field in a database. Applicants respectfully submit that contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, the referenced portions of Jacobson do not disclose or suggest Applicants’ claimed invention. Applicants respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are believed to be in order, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. The Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned with any concerns in furtherance of the prosecution of the present application.

Please charge any deficiency as well as any other fee(s) which may become due at any time during the pendency of this application, or credit any overpayment of such fee(s) to Deposit Account No. 50-0369. Also, in the event any extensions of time for responding are required for the pending application(s), please treat this paper as a petition to extend the time as required and charge Deposit Account No. 50-0369 therefor.

Respectfully submitted,

12 Feb 2007
Dated:

Brian Michaelis
Brian L. Michaelis (Reg. No. 34,221)
Customer No. 21710
Attorney for Applicant(s)
BROWN RUDNICK BERLACK ISRAELS LLP
One Financial Center, Box IP
Boston, MA 02111
Tel: 617-856-8369
Fax: 617 856-8201